Guinn

Dear Paul, 11/23/78

Your 11/18 and enclosures, including your 11/13, came yesterday. Whatever made it hectic when you got back, I hope it had nothing to do with your beautiful little girl.

Your are correct in assuming I have much disgareement withyour Inquiry piece on the committee but no purpose will be served by going into it. I do say that I believe the references and the nature of the references to the "critics" is in some ways much understated and that I'd have much less disagreement with most of what you say if you'd said the same thing in a different way,

I would like very much to go over the personal stuff you got, particularly the parts dealing with the FBI aborting of the DJ thought of general disclosure in 1972. I believe that some of these things may be of great value to Jim, too.

Your comment on Sylvia's list does seem to indicate that it cannot be used to locate what she refers to. Perhaps if it refers to content you did not - and I assume she got the same records from AIB - it might be of interest.

On the HSCA handouts, I do want a complete set but there is no point in making any copies until I get those Jeff Goldberg has for me. He was to have mailed them or left them at Jim's office for me to pick up the 21 when I was there but didn't. I do have a few that Kevin got for me.

I have about 25,000 pages of Dallas bulkys, 8 large cartons. The student who was establishing the file for me has not been back for a while and I've not located a replacement so they are still in the cartons. If you are in touch with Mark Allen let him know this. He was interested in some of them, I think.

Your few notes include the areas of my interest in Guinn and they begin with what interested me most: how did he know he was testing the right samples?

Did he compare them in more than weight? Were any heavier than he expected?

Did he have photographs that enable indetification?

Were they identified by FBI Lab numbers?

Why did he not test jacket material, other than on clothing?

Why no test to determine possibility common origin Q2 and Q3, the two larger and front seat fragments? Could he not have done this with jacket material?

I believe there is a possibility that he did not get the original samples and when their weights do not match I am more concerned about this. I have no problem at all believing I know the source of any substitutions for the actual samples, like Connally wrist (What do your figures represent here?)

Did he examine the crubstone itself?

If he did, is he satisfied he got a pristine specimen from it? Is he satisfied it was in the original condition, save for the removal of earlier sample?

If he did not make this examination, why not?

He regards those FBI people he knew, particularly Gallagher, as friends. He does not know how unfriendly Gallagher was behind his back and wouldn't believe it when I raised this with him by mail. He didn't even want to see the records indicative of this.

In my view the cOmmittee's use of its experts was the traditional prosecutorial misuse. Of these the most effective was Guinn. The most corrupt was Wadem who was basic to all others. Expert witnesses believe it is right and proper to test only what they are asked to test, to testify to that alone, and to testify only to what they are asked about. This requires an adversarial situation if there is to be any possibility of their being even honest. In my view even your straight arrow was crooked. As an expert he knows the obligations of an expert and he did not meet them.

This gets to one of my areas of disappointment with the commentary provided contemporaneously. If this was perceived it was not addressed. Believe me, I was aghast at some I caught.

In your article your express a hope that comes from an inability to even now face the certainty that the committee is other than you hoped it would be. I put it this way in an effort to get you to shall I say clear your mind? It is not to offend. There simply is no chance that the committee will disclose its executive sessions transcripts. I'll not be a bit surprised if at a time for which I do not expect to be around it is known that some can't be found.

They dare not. It is that simple.

We have a sample in the King area, which never was and never will be the real King area. It is entirely a Ray area. More than one sample.

They have done these things in executive session to cover their own asses.

Some of it would rehabilitate Joe McCarthy. Some is not ended. See what they try with John Ray. If he were a liberal instead of an arch reactionary and not a racist the ACLU would be screaming. Their informants are another such delicate area they dare not let be known and understood. (I've turned one of them on and am getting isngificant information from him, including copies of records.)

Jim, who has need of transcipts of the testimony of his own client can't get them. He can't keep his notes on them when he examines them. He can't have his subject expert see them.

(Blakey has refused me copies of what is in the public domain for use in court. He says I can examine them in the committee's offices, knowing full well that I cannot put that in court.)

What the committee has done, regardless of what you want to be the case, is do all its dirty work in executive session. It then takes the position that it cannot disclose the contents because it has immunized those who testified. It did this not in their interest but in its own. For example, Jim recently opposed this with John Ray but in court they have John immunized for his coming testimony. While immunization, without doubt, some witnesses would have asked for, the committee did it unbidden to have its formula work. it immunizes and then on the basis of immunization withholds. Only not quite. It reserves the right to make selective citation of these transcripts. This means that they can actually quote their own corruption. I mean this literally. Jim caught them in several and got into a shouting match of about 5 minutes before they would let him correct their gross and deliberate mistakes. They would and did alter the sums on checks and the dates on letters and insist on their deliberate corruptions of such basic information.

I'll be there with Jim and John. I leave first on a short trip. I think they will be McCarthyite if not as crudely as in executive session.

In your article you refer to a record I donot recall, staff realization that the executive agencies were withholding.

You also refer to the Anderson column bringing to light the Army's destruction of its JFK files. There were three. I gave this to my friend there, Jes Whitten. The Army was no-spik-ing me until a guy was about to retire. Then he sent me the file numbers he got by pressing the right keys.

Thanks and best to you all,